

Application Serial No. 10/581,953
Reply to Office Action of February 14, 2008

JUN 05 2008

PATENT
Docket: CU-4850**REMARKS**

In the Office Action, dated February 14, 2008, Claims 1-12 are pending and the Examiner states they are rejected. By the present Amendment, Applicant amends the claims.

1. Rejection of Claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, because the Examiner considers they are indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant has amended Claims 1, 2, 4 and 6 to bring further clarity to the claim set. Such amendments were executed solely to correct grammatical issues and to advance prosecution without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter thereof. These amendments clarify that there is a first and a second impregnated paper layer and that the second impregnated paper layer is formed by a paper impregnated with the thermosetting resin and cured. Furthermore, the phrase "is adjacent to" has been deleted as suggested by the Office Action.

As such, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

2. Rejection of Claims 1-8 and 10 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting

Claims 1-8 and 10 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting over Claims 1-3 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,514,624 in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,558,799, and over Claims 1-10 of U.S. Pat. No. 6,558,799 in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,514,624 for the reasons of record. Applicant respectfully disagrees with and traverses this rejection.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that each of the surface layer and the base material layers comprises an impregnated paper layer. In contrast, U.S. Pat. Nos. 6,514,624 and 6,558,799 are silent regarding both of these layers comprising an impregnated paper layer. As such, even if these references were combined as suggested by the Office Action, they would still not teach or suggest all of the features of rejected Claim 1.

Since independent Claim 1 is patentable over the prior art, all claims depending therefrom should be patentable by virtue of their dependency on a patentable independent claim, as well as for the features that they recite. As such,

Application Serial No. 10/581,953
Reply to Office Action of February 14, 2008

PATENT
Docket: CU-4850

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection of Claims 1-8 and 10.

3. Rejection of Claims 1-8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Takemoto (U.S. Pat. No. 6,514,624) for the reasons of record. Applicant respectfully disagrees with and traverses this rejection.

As previously mentioned, Independent Claim 1 recites that each of the surface layer and the base material layers comprise an impregnated paper layer. In contrast, U.S. Pat. No. 6,514,624 is silent regarding both of these layers comprising an impregnated paper layer. As such, Takemoto does not teach or suggest all of the features of rejected Claim 1.

Since independent Claim 1 is patentable over Takemoto, all claims depending therefrom should be patentable by virtue of their dependency on a patentable independent claim, as well as for the features that they recite. As such, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

4. Rejection of Claims 1-8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1-8 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Takeuchi (U.S. Pat. No. 6,558,799) for the reasons of record. Applicant respectfully disagrees with and traverses this rejection.

As previously mentioned, independent Claim 1 recites that each of the surface layer and the base material layers comprise an impregnated paper layer. In contrast, U.S. Pat. No. 6,558,799 is silent regarding both of these layers comprising an impregnated paper layer. As such, Takeuchi does not teach or suggest all of the features of rejected Claim 1.

Since independent Claim 1 is patentable over Takeuchi, all claims depending therefrom should be patentable by virtue of their dependency on a patentable independent claim, as well as for the features that they recite. As such, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

5. Rejection of Claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Arai et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,196,033) for the reasons of record. Applicant respectfully disagrees

Application Serial No. 10/581,953
Reply to Office Action of February 14, 2008

PATENT
Docket: CU-4850

with and traverses this rejection.

At the outset, Applicant has amended Claim 1 to recite wherein the blocking layer is formed to cover an entire surface of the surface resin layer. Such amendment was made solely in the interest of advancing prosecution and without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. In contrast to independent Claim 1, the blocking layer (6) disclosed in Arai et al. is not formed to cover the entire surface of the surface resin layer. This technical difference allows the present invention to attain advantageous effects of obtaining both the excellent surface endurance and internal endurance. As such, Arai et al. does not teach or suggest all of the features of independent Claim 1 and cannot be used as a reference to reject this claim as obvious.

Since independent Claim 1 is patentable over Arai et al., all claims depending therefrom should be patentable by virtue of their dependency on a patentable independent claim, as well as for the features that they recite. As such, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Rejection of Claims 8-9 and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 8-9 and 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Arai et al., Takemoto and Takeuchi et al. in view of Rosenkranz et al. for the reasons of record. Applicant respectfully disagrees with and traverses this rejection.

As Applicant has previously mentioned, independent Claim 1 is patentable over Arai et al., Takemoto and Takeuchi et al. As such, all claims depending therefrom should be patentable by virtue of their dependency on a patentable independent claim, as well as for the features that they recite. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 8-9 and 11-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Application Serial No. 10/581,953
Reply to Office Action of February 14, 2008


PATENT
Docket: CU-4850

In light of the foregoing response, all the outstanding objections and rejections are considered overcome. Applicant respectfully submits that this application should now be in condition for allowance and respectfully requests favorable consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

June 5, 2008

Date



Attorney for Applicant
Brian W. Hameder
c/o Ladas & Parry LLP
224 South Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60604
(312) 427-1300
Reg. No. 45613